



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/689,168	10/20/2003	Milind M. Buddhikot	Buddhikot 10-3-5-3-12-13	9461
46363	7590	05/28/2008	EXAMINER	
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, LLP/ LUCENT TECHNOLOGIES, INC 595 SHREWSBURY AVENUE SHREWSBURY, NJ 07702				
			RUSSELL, WANDA Z	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2616	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/28/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary**Application No.**

10/689,168

Applicant(s)

BUDDHIKOT ET AL.

Examiner

WANDA Z. RUSSELL

Art Unit

2616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 April 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SI/309)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. **Claims 1-3, 9-11, and 15-20** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Choyi et al. (Pub No. US 2005/0213545 A1).

For **claim 1**, Choyi et al. teach a gateway (MAR, MAR acts as the Gateway, refer to [0141], lines 1-2) for mobile communications, comprising:

a cache (binding or probable, refer to [0141], lines 8-9) for storing recently downloaded from a network (refer to [0141], lines 9-12);

a mobile IP foreign agent (The MAR may serve as a foreign agent, refer to [0141], line 3); and

a packet filter (The gateway includes two sub-components: the gateway controller and the gateway filter, refer to [0054], last 2 lines) that directs requests for the network data from a mobile node to the cache (The filter checks to see if packets coming from within the domain are to be sent to the GC or forwarded on to the Internet, refer to [0055], lines 3-6),

the packet filter directing the requested network data from the cache to the mobile node by way of the foreign agent, without forwarding the requested network data to a home agent of the mobile node (The home agent is not notified of movements within the foreign domain and connectivity is maintained using dynamically established paths in the foreign domain, refer to [0039], last 3 lines).

For **claim 2**, Choyi et al. teach the gateway of claim 1, further comprising a storage device (binding or probable cache, refer to [0141], lines 8-12. Cache is a storage device) that stores a state of the mobile node, the state of the mobile node being updated in the storage device when the mobile node moves from the proximity of the gateway to the proximity of a second gateway having a second foreign agent (To avoid having a bottleneck in the network, it is possible to interconnect MARs together. The principle is to have several MAR serving the wireless domain to decrease the load, as each MAR will support only a part of the mobile users actually moving in the domain. The MARs are interconnected together, and the principle is that the mobile node can move to a part of the domain controlled by another MAR simply by having the BSR serving the mobile node sending a join message up to the previous MAR, refer to [0367], lines 1-9),

wherein the packet filter directs the requested network data from the cache to the mobile node by way of the second foreign agent, without forwarding the requested network data to the first foreign agent or a home agent of the mobile node, while the mobile node is in the proximity of the second gateway (The home agent is not notified of

movements within the foreign domain and connectivity is maintained using dynamically established paths in the foreign domain, refer to [0039], last 3 lines).

For **claim 3**, Choyi et al. teach the gateway of claim 2, wherein the state of the mobile node in the storage device is updated in response to a message from the second gateway (from probable to binding, refer to [0141], lines 9-12).

For **claim 9**, it is a means claim corresponding to claim 1, therefore it is rejected for the same reason above.

For **claim 10**, it is a means claim corresponding to claim 2, therefore it is rejected for the same reason above.

For **claim 11**, it is a means claim corresponding to claim 3, therefore it is rejected for the same reason above.

For **claim 15**, it is a method claim corresponding to claim 1, therefore it is rejected for the same reason above.

For **claim 16**, it is a method claim corresponding to claim 2, therefore it is rejected for the same reason above.

For **claim 17**, it is a method claim corresponding to claim 2, therefore it is rejected for the same reason above.

For **claim 18**, it is a computer readable medium claim corresponding to claim 1, therefore it is rejected for the same reason above.

For **claim 19**, it is a computer readable medium claim corresponding to claim 2, therefore it is rejected for the same reason above.

For **claim 20**, it is a computer readable medium claim corresponding to claim 2, therefore it is rejected for the same reason above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 4-8, and 12-14** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Choyi et al. (Pub No. US 2005/0213545 A1), in view of Forslow (U.S. Patent 6,954,790).

For **claim 4**, Choyi et al. teach everything claimed as applied above (see claim 1).

However, Choyi et al. fail to specifically teach the gateway of claim 1, wherein the packet filter adds at least one packet-mangling rule to a set of firewall policies associated with the mobile node.

Forslow teaches the gateway of claim 1, wherein the packet filter adds at least one packet-mangling rule to a set of firewall policies associated with the mobile node (col. 5, lines 51-56).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine [Choyi et al.] with [Forslow] to obtain the invention as specified, to provide robust security for the local portion of workgroup networks and their individual server resources.

For **claim 5**, Choyi et al. and Forslow teach everything claimed as applied above (see claim 1, and 4). However, Choyi et al. fails to specifically teach the gateway of claim 4, wherein the at least one packet-mangling rule is user-specific.

Forslow teaches the gateway of claim 4, wherein the at least one packet-mangling rule is user-specific (col. 5, line 51).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine [Choyi et al.] with [Forslow] to obtain the invention as specified, to provide user friendly service.

For **claim 6**, Choyi et al. and Forslow teach everything claimed as applied above (see claim 1, 4, and 5). In addition, Choyi et al. teach the gateway of claim 5, wherein the gateway has at least one port for coupling directly or indirectly to an 802.11 access point ([0252], last line).

For **claim 7**, Choyi et al. teach everything claimed as applied above (see claim 1).

However, Choyi et al. fails to specifically teach the gateway of claim 1, wherein the packet filter performs multi-level filtering.

Forslow teaches the gateway of claim 1, wherein the gateway of claim 1, wherein the packet filter performs multi-level filtering (col. 14, line 3).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine [Choyi et al.] with [Forslow] to obtain the invention as specified, to provide robust security for the local portion of workgroup networks and their individual server resources.

For **claim 8**, Choyi et al. teach everything claimed as applied above (see claim 1).

However, Choyi et al. fails to specifically teach the gateway of claim 1, wherein the packet filter performs network layer filtering and one of the group consisting of transport layer filtering and application layer filtering.

Forslow teaches the gateway of claim 1, wherein the packet filter performs network layer filtering (WG Tier, col. 13, lines 33-34, and 27-30) and one of the group consisting of transport layer filtering (MVPN Tier, col. 13, line 30) and application layer filtering (ServiceNet Tier, col. 13, line 30).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine [Choyi et al.] with [Forslow] to obtain the invention as specified, to provide robust security for the local portion of workgroup networks and their individual server resources.

For **claim 12**, it is a means claim corresponding to claim 4, therefore it is rejected for the same reason above.

For **claim 13**, it is a means claim corresponding to claim 5, therefore it is rejected for the same reason above.

For **claim 14**, it is a means claim corresponding to claim 6, therefore it is rejected for the same reason above.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to WANDA Z. RUSSELL whose telephone number is

(571)270-1796. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 9:00-6:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Seema Rao can be reached on (571) 272-3174. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Seema S. Rao/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 2616

WZR/Wanda Z Russell/
Examiner, Art Unit 2616